arXiv:0901.1569v2 [gr-qc] 28 Apr 2009

Isolated Horizon structures in quasiequilibrium black hole initial data

José Luis Jaramillo[1, 2, *]

[1] *Instituto de Astrofísica de Andalucía, CSIC, Apartado Postal 3004, Granada 18080, Spain*
[2] *Laboratoire Univers et Théories (LUTH), Observatoire de Paris, CNRS,*
Université Paris Diderot ; 5 place Jules Janssen, 92190 Meudon, France

(Dated: 24 April 2009)

Isolated horizon conditions enforce the time invariance of both the intrinsic and the extrinsic geometry of a (quasilocal) black hole horizon. Nonexpanding horizons, only requiring the invariance of the intrinsic geometry, have been successfully employed in the (excision) initial data of black holes in instantaneous equilibrium. Here we propose the use of the full isolated horizon structure when solving the elliptic system resulting from the complete set of conformal 3+1 Einstein equations under a quasiequilibrium ansatz prescription. We argue that a set of geometric inner boundary conditions for this extended elliptic system then follows, determining the shape of the excision surface.

PACS numbers: 04.25.dg, 02.60.Lj, 04.20.Ex, 04.25.D-

I. GENERAL PROBLEM AND SPECIFIC GOAL

Here we discuss the use of the whole structure of an isolated horizon in order to set inner boundary conditions for constructing quasiequilibrium (binary) black hole initial data, when solving the full set of Einstein equations under a quasiequilibrium approximation. This extends existing proposals in the literature that exploit partially the isolated horizon framework, specifically the so-called *nonexpanding horizon* (NEH) structure. We focus on approaches to initial data based on a conformal decomposition of the data on a spacelike slice Σ. Part of the data (γ_{ab}, K^{ab}), respectively the 3-metric and the extrinsic curvature, must be chosen *a priori* to set the constraints as a well-posed elliptic system. The physical content encoded in that choice is difficult to assess, and this has led to schemes where the whole set of Einstein equations is solved under a certain quasi-equilibrium approximation (e.g. [1, 2, 3]). We consider black hole data implementing an excision technique. Inner boundary conditions must then be discussed to complete the elliptic system. In the setting of the (extended) conformal thin sandwich (XCTS) equations [4], inner boundary conditions that characterize the excised sphere as an apparent horizon in instantaneous equilibrium have been presented in [5, 6]. These boundary conditions exploit the nonexpanding horizon notion, the first level in the hierarchy considered in the isolated horizon framework [7, 8]. The specific purpose of this paper is to argue that, going beyond nonexpanding horizons and using the whole (strongly) isolated horizon structure, inner boundary conditions for the (conformal) metric can be derived. These conditions can then be implemented in the resolution of the full set of Einstein equations under a quasiequilibrium ansatz [1, 2, 3], where they determine the extrinsic curvature (shape) of the excision surface.

As a further physical motivation for the full isolated horizon structure, we comment on a one-parameter family of horizon slicings with potential interest in the discussion of quasilocal black hole linear momentum.

A. 3+1 decompositions.

We consider 3+1 foliations $\{\Sigma_t\}$ of spacetimes $(\mathcal{M}, g_{ab})$, with Levi-Civita connection ∇_a. We denote by n^a the timelike unit normal to the spacelike Σ_t. The evolution vector is $t^a = Nn^a + \beta^a$, with N the lapse function and β^a the shift vector. We denote by γ_{ab} the induced metric on Σ_t, i.e. $\gamma_{ab} = g_{ab} + n_a n_b$, and by D_a its associated Levi-Civita connection. The sign convention for the extrinsic curvature of (Σ_t, γ_{ab}) inside $(\mathcal{M}, g_{ab})$ is $K_{ab} := -\frac{1}{2}\mathcal{L}_n \gamma_{ab} = -\gamma_a{}^c \nabla_c n_b$.

B. Closed 2-surfaces.

Given a 2-surface $\mathcal{S}_t \subset \Sigma_t$, s^a is the spacelike unit normal vector pointing *outwards* (towards infinity in the asymptotically flat case) and tangent to Σ_t. The normal plane $T_p^\perp \mathcal{S}_t$ at $p \in \mathcal{S}_t$ is spanned by n^a and s^a. Alternatively, one can span $T_p^\perp \mathcal{S}_t$ in terms of the *outgoing* and *ingoing* null normals, respectively denoted as ℓ^a and k^a, satisfying $k^c \ell_c = -1$. Directions defined by ℓ^a and k^a are uniquely determined, but a boost-normalization freedom remains. We can then write $\ell^a = f \cdot (n^a + s^a)$ and $k^a = \frac{1}{2f}(n^a - s^a)$, up to a factor f. The induced metric on $\mathcal{S}_t$ is given by: $q_{ab} = g_{ab} + k_a \ell_b + \ell_a k_b = g_{ab} + n_a n_b - s_a s_b = \gamma_{ab} - s_a s_b$, The Levi-Civita connection associated with q_{ab} is ${}^2D_a$. We define the *second fundamental tensor* of $(\mathcal{S}, q_{ab})$ in $(\mathcal{M}, g_{ab})$ as $\mathcal{K}^c_{ab} := q^d{}_a q^e{}_b \nabla_d q^c{}_e$, so that

$$\mathcal{K}^c_{ab} = n^c \Theta^{(n)}_{ab} + s^c \Theta^{(s)}_{ab} = k^c \Theta^{(\ell)}_{ab} + \ell^c \Theta^{(k)}_{ab} \ , \qquad (1)$$

where the *deformation tensor* $\Theta^{(v)}_{ab}$ associated with v^a normal to $\mathcal{S}$ is defined as $\Theta^{(v)}_{ab} := q^c{}_a q^e{}_b \nabla_c v_d$. The extrinsic curvature H_{ab} of $(\mathcal{S}_t, q_{ab})$ in (Σ_t, γ_{ab}) corresponds

---

[*] Electronic address: jarama@iaa.es

to $\Theta^{(s)}_{ab}$: $H_{ab} \equiv q^c{}_a q^d{}_b D_c s_d = \Theta^{(s)}_{ab}$. Extrinsic curvature information of $(\mathcal{S}, q_{ab})$ in $(\mathcal{M}, g_{ab})$ is completed by the *normal fundamental forms* associated with normal vectors v^a. We shall employ the 1-form $\Omega^{(\ell)}_a := k^c q^d{}_a \nabla_d \ell_c$.

II. ISOLATED HORIZONS

Isolated horizons [8] provide a setting for black hole horizons in equilibrium inside a dynamical spacetime. The minimal notion of equilibrium is given by a NEH. A NEH is a $S^2 \times \mathbb{R}$ null hypersurface $\mathcal{H}$, on which the Einstein equation holds under a certain energy condition, and that is sliced by marginally (outer) trapped surfaces. That is, the expansion associated with ℓ^a vanishes on $\mathcal{H}$: $\theta^{(\ell)} = q^{ab}\Theta^{(\ell)}_{ab} = 0$. The geometry of a NEH is characterized by the pair $(q_{ab}, \hat{\nabla}_c)$, where q_{ab} is the induced null metric on $\mathcal{H}$ and $\hat{\nabla}_a$ is the unique connection (not a Levi-Civita one) induced from the ambient spacetime connection. The connection $\hat{\nabla}_a$ characterizes the *extrinsic geometry* of the NEH tube. Expression $\hat{\nabla}_a \ell^b = \omega^{(\ell)}_a \ell^b$ defines a 1-form $\omega^{(\ell)}_a$ intrinsic to $\mathcal{H}$, for each ℓ^a. A *surface gravity* $\kappa_{(\ell)}$ is then defined from the acceleration of ℓ^a, i.e. $\ell^c \hat{\nabla}_c \ell^a = \kappa_{(\ell)} \ell^a$. In terms of the normal fundamental form introduced above, we can write $\omega^{(\ell)}_a = \Omega^{(\ell)}_a - \kappa_{(\ell)} k_a$ (cf. Eq. (5.35) in [7]).

A hierarchy on $\mathcal{H}$ results from the progressive demand of geometry invariance under the ℓ^a (evolution) flow:
(i) A NEH is characterized by the *time invariance* of the intrinsic geometry q_{ab}: $\mathcal{L}_\ell q_{ab} = 2\, \Theta^{(\ell)}_{ab} = 0$.
(ii) A weakly isolated horizon (WIH) is a NEH, together with an equivalence class of null normals $[\ell^a]$, for which the 1-form $\omega^{(\ell)}_a$ is time-invariant: $\mathcal{L}_\ell \omega^{(\ell)}_a = 0$. This is equivalent to the surface gravity constancy: $\hat{\nabla}_a \kappa_{(\ell)} = 0$.
(iii) An isolated horizon (IH) is a WIH on which the whole extrinsic geometry is time-invariant: $[\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{H}}_\ell, \hat{\nabla}_a] = 0$.

NEH and IH equilibrium levels represent genuine restrictions on the geometry of $\mathcal{H}$ as a hypersurface in $(\mathcal{M}, g_{ab})$ [this is not the case for a WIH, that can always be constructed on a NEH by an appropriate choice of ℓ^a]. Writing $\Theta^{(\ell)}_{ab} = \sigma^{(\ell)}_{ab} + \frac{1}{2}\theta^{(\ell)} q_{ab}$, NEH conditions translate into the vanishing of the shear $\sigma^{(\ell)}_{ab}$ and expansion $\theta^{(\ell)}$:

$$\Theta^{(\ell)}_{ab} = 0 \quad \Longleftrightarrow \quad \theta^{(\ell)} = 0 \ \ , \ \ \sigma^{(\ell)}_{ab} = 0 \ . \tag{2}$$

These NEH conditions fix part of the extrinsic curvature of $\mathcal{S}_t$ [cf. Equation (1)] and have been considered in [5, 6]. In the next equilibrium level, (strongly) IH conditions can be expressed as (cf. Eq. (5.2) in [9] or Eq. (9.4) in [7])

$$\begin{aligned} \kappa_{(\ell)} \Theta^{(k)}_{ab} \ &= \ \frac{1}{2}\left({}^2D_a \Omega^{(\ell)}_b + {}^2D_b \Omega^{(\ell)}_a\right) + \Omega^{(\ell)}_a \Omega^{(\ell)}_b \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2}{}^2R_{ab} + 4\pi \left(q^c{}_a q^d{}_b T_{cd} - \frac{T}{2} q_{ab}\right) \ , \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

where ${}^2R_{ab}$ is the q_{ab}-Ricci tensor, T_{ab} is the stress-energy tensor, and $T = g^{cd}T_{cd}$. Condition (3) represents a geometric constraint on the IH data (cf. discussion in [9]). From Eq. (1), NEH conditions (2) together with the IH constraint (3) fix completely the second fundamental form $\mathcal{K}^c_{ab}$ of $\mathcal{S}_t$. Surface gravity $\kappa_{(\ell)}$ in (3) must be set to a constant value, $\kappa_{(\ell)} = \kappa_o$. This entails no loss of generality, due to the gauge freedom in the WIH structure [7, 8]. Inserting in (3) the 3+1 expressions of $\Omega^{(\ell)}_a$ and $\Theta^{(k)}_{ab}$

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega^{(\ell)}_a \ &= \ -q^c{}_a s^d K_{cd} + {}^2D_a \ln f \\ \Theta^{(k)}_{ab} \ &= \ -\frac{1}{2f}\left(H_{ab} + q^c{}_a q^d{}_b K_{cd}\right) \ , \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

a constraint on the 3+1 fields evaluated on $\mathcal{S}_t$ follows. From the trace of (3), expansion $\theta^{(k)} = \Theta^{(k)}_{cd} q^{cd}$ satisfies

$$\theta^{(k)} = \frac{1}{\kappa_o}\left({}^2D^c\Omega^{(\ell)}_c + \Omega^{(\ell)}_c \Omega^c_{(\ell)} - \frac{1}{2}{}^2R + 4\pi\left(q^{cd}T_{cd} - T\right)\right) . \tag{5}$$

Adapting $\ell^a = f \cdot (n^a + s^a)$ to the 3+1 slicing, i.e. $f = N$, Eq. (5) becomes the condition (11.24) in [7] for the lapse N. The traceless part of (3) completely fixes the ingoing shear $\sigma^{(k)}_{ab}$. From the equality between the two independent expressions from (3) and (4) for

$$\sigma^{(k)}_{ab} \ = \ \Theta^{(k)}_{ab} - \frac{1}{2}\theta^{(k)} q_{ab} \ \ , \tag{6}$$

it follows a geometric condition on 2 degrees of freedom associated with the traceless part of the extrinsic curvature of the excised surface $\mathcal{S}$ as embedded in Σ.

III. QUASI-EQUILIBRIUM APPROXIMATIONS TO EINSTEIN EQUATIONS

Initial data for Cauchy evolutions of Einstein equations are constructed by solving the constraint equations. Under a conformal ansatz, constraints are cast as a scalar and a vector elliptic equations. In the XCTS approach [4], an additional elliptic equation for the (conformal) lapse follows from maximal slicing. Part of the initial data must be chosen freely. An approach to this consists in solving the whole set of Einstein equations under a quasiequilibrium approximation (e.g. [1, 2, 3]). We briefly review the approach in [2]. A fiducial time-independent flat metric f_{ab}, $\partial_t f_{ab} = 0$, with connection $\mathcal{D}_a$ is introduced. Then, a conformal decomposition of the data (γ_{ab}, K^{ab}) is performed by choosing a conformal representative $\tilde{\gamma}_{ab}$ through the unimodular condition $\det \tilde{\gamma}_{ab} = \det f_{ab}$. We write $\gamma_{ab} = \Psi^4 \tilde{\gamma}_{ab}$, and $K^{ab} = \Psi^{-4}\tilde{A}^{ab} + \frac{1}{3}K\gamma^{ab}$, with $K = \gamma^{cd}K_{cd}$ and $\tilde{A}^{ab}$

$$\tilde{A}^{ab} = \frac{1}{2N}\left(\tilde{D}^a\beta^b + \tilde{D}^b\beta^a - \frac{2}{3}\tilde{D}_c\beta^c\tilde{\gamma}^{ab} + \partial_t\tilde{\gamma}^{ab}\right) , \tag{7}$$

where $\tilde{D}_a$ is the Levi-Civita connection associated with $\tilde{\gamma}_{ab}$. The constrained evolution scheme in [2] gives rise to a mixed elliptic-hyperbolic system whose elliptic subsystem is given by the following equations. The Hamiltonian constraint becomes an equation for Ψ whereas the momentum constraint translates into an equation for β^a. Maximal slicing and a Dirac-like gauge condition, namely preservation in time of $K = 0$ and $\mathcal{D}_c \tilde{\gamma}^{ca} = 0$, are considered in [2]. From $\dot{K} = 0$ an elliptic equation for the lapse N follows. The resulting XCTS-like elliptic subsystem on Ψ, β^a and N is formally expressed as

$$L_\Psi \Psi = S_\Psi \ , \ L_\beta \beta^a = S^a_\beta \ , \ L_N N = S_N \ \ , \tag{8}$$

with the elliptic operators L_Ψ, L_β and L_N and the sources S_Ψ, S^a_β and S_N (cf. [2]). The hyperbolic part consists of a wavelike equation on $\tilde{\gamma}^{ab}$

$$\frac{\partial^2 \tilde{\gamma}^{ab}}{\partial t^2} - \frac{N^2}{\Psi^4} \tilde{\Delta} \tilde{\gamma}^{ab} - 2\mathcal{L}_\beta \frac{\partial \tilde{\gamma}^{ab}}{\partial t} + \mathcal{L}_\beta \mathcal{L}_\beta \tilde{\gamma}^{ab} = S^{ab}_{\tilde{\gamma}} \ \ , \tag{9}$$

with $S^{ab}_{\tilde{\gamma}}$ not depending on second derivatives of $\tilde{\gamma}^{ab}$. The quasiequilibrium scheme follows by setting in (9) the values of $\partial_t \tilde{\gamma}^{ab}$ and $\frac{\partial^2 \tilde{\gamma}^{ab}}{\partial t^2}$ to appropriate *a priori* prescribed quantities. Then, Eqs. (9) and (8) define an extended elliptic system. In this brief paper we discuss neither outer boundary conditions nor bulk quasiequilibrium prescriptions [1, 2, 3], and focus on inner boundary conditions derived from IH structures when using excision.

A. NEH inner boundary conditions

NEH conditions (2) and the gauge adaptation of the coordinate system to the excision tube can be used to fix four inner conditions in the elliptic subsystem (8). We conformally rescale the relevant objects on $\mathcal{S}$: $\tilde{q}_{ab} = \Psi^{-4} q_{ab}$, with connection ${}^2\tilde{D}_a$, $\tilde{s}^a = \Psi^2 s^a$ and the 2+1 decomposition of the shift $\beta^a = \beta_\perp s^a + \beta^a_\parallel$, with $\beta^c_\parallel s_c = 0$ and $\beta_\perp = \beta^c s_c$. Condition $\theta^{(\boldsymbol{\ell})} = 0$ in (2) translates into

$$4\tilde{s}^c \tilde{D}_c \Psi + \tilde{D}_c \tilde{s}^c \Psi = - \ \Psi^3 \tilde{A}_{cd} \tilde{s}^c \tilde{s}^d + \frac{2}{3} \Psi^3 K. \tag{10}$$

Coordinate adaptation to the horizon, namely $t^a = \ell^a + \beta^a_\parallel$, and the vanishing of $\sigma^{(\ell)}_{ab}$ in (2) [here we use $\partial_t \tilde{\gamma}^{ab} = 0$; cf. [7] for general expressions] become conditions [7]

$$\beta^\perp = N \ \ , \ \ {}^2\tilde{D}^a \beta^b_\parallel + {}^2\tilde{D}^b \beta^a_\parallel - ({}^2\tilde{D}_c \beta^c_\parallel)\, \tilde{q}^{ab} = 0 \ \ . \tag{11}$$

In the XCTS context, a fifth boundary condition, generally interpreted as a condition on the lapse N, is chosen arbitrarily to complete the elliptic system (8).

B. IH inner boundary conditions.

IH boundary conditions (3) represent three geometric conditions, to be set together with the NEH ones. As discussed above, under the ℓ^a-normalization choice $f = N$, IH equation (5) on $\theta^{(k)}$ becomes a condition on N. Therefore, all inner boundary conditions for the system (8) are determined. The only remaining freedom, necessary to avoid degeneracies, is in the choice of the constant κ_o.

Regarding the elliptic system (9) on $\tilde{\gamma}^{ab}$, we need to assess five boundary conditions (see [3] for the first discussion of this issue). The spatial gauge determines three of the degrees of freedom associated with $\tilde{\gamma}^{ab}$ on $\mathcal{S}$ (cf. [3, 10] for two alternative perspectives on this, both based on the use of Dirac-like gauges $\mathcal{D}_c \tilde{\gamma}^{ca} = 0$).

IH condition (6) can then be used to set inner conditions for the remaining 2 degrees of freedom of $\tilde{\gamma}^{ab}$. Condition (6) can be seen as a (nonlinear) Robin condition on two of the degrees of freedom of $\tilde{\gamma}^{ab}$ (or $\tilde{q}^{ab}$). This follows from: i) the complete determination of H_{ab} from joined NEH and IH conditions, ii) the writing $H_{ab} = \Psi^2(\tilde{H}_{ab} + 2\tilde{s}^c \tilde{D}_c \ln \Psi \tilde{q}_{ab})$ [where $\tilde{H}_{ab}$ is the extrinsic curvature of $(\mathcal{S}, \tilde{q}_{ab})$ into $(\Sigma, \tilde{\gamma}_{ab})$], and iii) the expression of $\tilde{H}_{ab}$ as the *radial* derivative $\tilde{H}_{ab} = \frac{1}{2} q^c{}_a q^d{}_b \mathcal{L}_{\tilde{s}} \tilde{q}_{cd}$.

The explicit form for the IH geometric boundary conditions is cumbersome, but it follows straightforwardly from the expression of (4) in terms of conformal quantities (we assume here $\partial_t \tilde{\gamma}^{ab} = 0$, but cf. Eqs. (10.105) and (10.106) in [7] for general expressions)

$$\begin{aligned}(\Theta^{(k)})^{ab} = &-\frac{1}{2N^2} \Bigg\{ (N + \beta^\perp) \Psi^{-2} \tilde{H}^{ab} + \frac{1}{2} \left[\tilde{D}^a \beta^b_\parallel + \tilde{D}^b \beta^a_\parallel \right] \\ &+ \Bigg[2\Psi^{-2} \tilde{s}^c \tilde{D}_c \ln \Psi + \frac{1}{3} \Bigg(NK - \beta^\perp \Psi^{-2} \tilde{H} - \tilde{s}^c \tilde{D}_c (\beta^\perp \Psi^{-2}) \\ &- {}^2\tilde{D}_c \beta^c_\parallel + \beta^c_\parallel \tilde{s}^d \tilde{D}_d \tilde{s}_c \Bigg) \Bigg] \ \tilde{q}^{ab} \Bigg\} ,\end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\Omega_a = {}^2\tilde{D}_a \ln N + \frac{\Psi^2}{2N} \Big[&-(\beta^\perp \Psi^{-2})^2 \tilde{s}^c \tilde{D}_c \tilde{s}_a - {}^2\tilde{D}_a (\beta^\perp \Psi^{-2}) \\ &+ \tilde{H}_{ac} \beta^c_\parallel - \tilde{q}_{ac} \tilde{s}^d \tilde{D}_d \beta^c_\parallel \Big] \ .\end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

IV. DISCUSSION

NEH conditions on an excised surface $\mathcal{S}$ determine three geometric conditions. (Strongly) IH conditions determine three additional geometric conditions, up to a freely chosen constant (the surface gravity κ_o). In geometric terms, they fully determine the *second fundamental form* $\mathcal{K}^c_{ab}$ of $\mathcal{S}$ in a spacetime $(\mathcal{M}, g_{ab})$. In a 3+1 description, this translates into the determination of both the extrinsic curvature H_{ab} of $\mathcal{S}$ in Σ and the projection onto $\mathcal{S}$ of the extrinsic curvature K_{ab} of Σ in $\mathcal{M}$.

These conditions can be expressed in terms of initial data (γ_{ab}, K^{ab}) on a 3-slice Σ. This nontrivial feature permits their use as inner boundary conditions in the construction of initial data. We have illustrated this in the particular case of an elliptic system resulting from a conformal decomposition of Einstein equations under a quasiequilibrium ansatz. Inner boundary conditions for a XCTS-like elliptic system (five equations) are determined from NEH conditions (three conditions), together with two additional ones: (i) the gauge adaptation of the coordinate system to the excised tube, and (ii) the IH condition for $\theta^{(k)}$. Inner boundary conditions for the elliptic system on the unimodular conformal metric $\tilde{\gamma}^{ab}$ follow from the spatial gauge (three conditions) and the traceless part of the IH conditions, i.e. the IH expression for $\sigma^{(k)}_{ab}$ (two conditions). Our main conclusion is the following: the full IH structure determines geometric conditions for a black hole in instantaneous equilibrium that fix (the physical) part of the inner boundary conditions of the conformal metric $\tilde{\gamma}^{ab}$. In particular, they fully determine the shape of the excision surface $\mathcal{S}$ in Σ.

IH conditions may have some further physical interest. Under maximal slicing and Dirac-like gauges, the only remaining freedom in the discussed system is the choice of the constant κ_o. This determines a one-parameter family of horizon foliations that fixes the inherent boost ambiguity in the IH description. On physical grounds, the fixing of the horizon-boost is expected to be related to a (quasilocal) linear momentum of the black hole. The matching of the latter with the prescription following from a post-Newtonian expansion could eventually be used to fix a preferred value of the parameter κ_o.

There is a number of important caveats in the present approach. First, we have only addressed issues of geometric nature, with no reference whatsoever to the analytic well-posedness of the considered elliptic boundary problem. Such an analysis is crucial to assess the actual validity of the IH conditions here discussed. The study in Ref. [10] is illustrative in this respect, since it shows a particular example (namely the single black hole case) where no inner boundary conditions for $\tilde{\gamma}^{ab}$ need to be specified. Though that example is fully compatible with the present IH proposal (the constructed Kerr data fulfill the inner IH conditions), it also points out the need of a general analytic study, something beyond the scope of the present geometric discussion. Second, the physical convenience of using (strongly) IH in the initial data construction can be called into question. They may represent too stringent conditions in certain realistic astrophysical situations where the use of NEH boundary conditions could prove to be enough. Third, the implementation of (strongly) IH conditions can be challenging from a numerical point of view. In the context of the last two caveats, the free (*effective*) inner boundary conditions for $\tilde{\gamma}^{ab}$ proposed in [3] represent an interesting alternative, at least in *generic* cases. In contrast with IH conditions, prescribing the shape of $\mathcal{S}$, conditions in [3] fix the (conformal) intrinsic geometry of $\mathcal{S}$. Technically, they are considerably simpler than IH conditions. All these issues must be assessed numerically.

The author acknowledges E. Gourgoulhon, P. Grandclément, B. Krishnan, J. Novak, M. Sánchez, J. A. Valiente-Kroon and N. Vasset for enlightening discussions. The author has been supported by the Spanish MICINN under project FIS2008-06078-C03-01/FIS and Junta de Andalucía under projects FQM2288, FQM219.

[1] M. Shibata, K. Uryu and J. L. Friedman, Phys. Rev. D **70**, 044044 (2004) [Erratum-ibid. D **70**, 129901 (2004)]

[2] S. Bonazzola, E. Gourgoulhon, P. Grandclément, and J. Novak, Phys. Rev. D **70**, 104007 (2004); I. Cordero-Carrion, J. M. Ibanez, E. Gourgoulhon, J. L. Jaramillo and J. Novak, Phys. Rev. D **77**, 084007 (2008)

[3] G. B. Cook and T. W. Baumgarte, Phys. Rev. D **78**, 104016 (2008).

[4] J. W. York Jr., Phys. Rev. Lett. **82**, 1350 (1999); H. P. Pfeiffer and J. W. York Jr., Phys. Rev. D **67**, 044022 (2003).

[5] G.B. Cook, Phys. Rev. D **65**, 084003 (2002); G.B. Cook, H.P. Pfeiffer, Phys. Rev. D **70**, 104016 (2004); M. Caudill, G. B. Cook, J. D. Grigsby, & H. P. Pfeiffer, Phys. Rev. D **74**, 064011 (2006).

[6] J.L. Jaramillo, E. Gourgoulhon, and G.A. Mena Marugán, Phys. Rev. D **70**, 124036 (2004); S. Dain, J.L. Jaramillo, and B. Krishnan, Phys. Rev. D **71**, 064003 (2005); J.L. Jaramillo, M. Ansorg, and F. Limousin, Phys. Rev. D**75**, 024019 (2007).

[7] E. Gourgoulhon and J.L. Jaramillo, Phys. Rep. **423**, 159 (2006).

[8] A. Ashtekar and B. Krishnan, Isolated and dynamical horizons and their applications. Liv. Rev. Relat. **7**, 10 (2004). URL (cited on 8 December 2008): `http://www.livingreviews.org/lrr-2004-10`

[9] A. Ashtekar, C. Beetle, and J. Lewandowski, Class. Quantum Grav. **19**, 1195 (2002).

[10] N. Vasset, J. Novak and J.L. Jaramillo, arXiv:0901.2052v1.